

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR RATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,315	12/08/2003	Kenneth L. Suazo	2224.006DIV	5073
75	90 02/09/2005		EXAM	INER
Ray R. Regan			LEE, JONG SUK	
LAW OFFICE	OF RAY R. REGAN P.A.			
P.O. Box 1442			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Corrales, NM 87048			3673	
			DATE MAILED: 02/09/200	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

V

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/731,315	SUAZO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Jong-Suk (James) Lee	3673	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

- If NO - Failt Any	If the period for reply specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) M Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, ever earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status	s					
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2004.					
2a)⊠	☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal maccordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 Conditions of the condition of the condition for allowance except for formal maccordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 Conditions of the condition of the condition for allowance except for formal maccordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 Condition for allowance except for formal maccordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 Condition for allowance except for formal maccordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 Condition for allowance except for formal maccordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 Condition for allowance except for formal maccordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 Condition for allowance except for formal maccordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 Condition for allowance except for allowance except for allowance except for allowance except for all the condition for all the conditions for all the	•				
Disposit	osition of Claims					
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) 7-19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
·	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
· —	Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected.					
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
اـــا(8	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Applicat	cation Papers					
9)[[☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abe	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the draw The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attack	***				
Priority	ity under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)[☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C	C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a)	a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
`	See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies i	iot received.				
Attachmen	ment(s)					
1) Notic	Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview	w Summary (PTO-413)				
		No(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
	Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/731,315

Art Unit: 3673

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. The receipt is acknowledged to a petition to director from final restriction requirement filed November 19, 2004.
- 2. The amendment filed November 19, 2004 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103® and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suazo (US 6,273,640) in view of Koch (US 3,446,025).

Suezo discloses a plastic lined canal with a conduit section comprising: a liner section (12, 38) having an entrance end, an exit end, and opposing fins therebetween; a locking channel segment (42) monolithically formed adjacent the exit end; opposing handle assemblies (46 A, B)

Art Unit: 3673

formed monolithically adjacent the entrance end and the exit end, wherein the liner section and the exit end are semi-circular in shape (see Figs. 1-2; col.2, lines 31-67; col.3, lines 1-23).

However, Suezo fails to disclose or fairly suggest means for anchoring the inlet/outlet box an the opposing handle assemblies include one or more holes for slidable engagement with a rod. Koch discloses a fluid distribution system comprising of a plurality of flume sections (1) having a handle assembly (2) with an anchor means/rod (3) being slidably installed through holes/slots (13) (see Figs. 1-4; col.1, lines 58-72; col.2, lines 1-62).

Therefore, in view of Koch, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the anchoring means with the rod to the opposing handle assemblies of Suezo in order to enhance the stability of the installed liner section.

Although Suezo fails to specifically disclose the inlet/outlet box, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the liner section as an end unit in order to intake or outlet the water to the system.

With respect to the entrance end being rectangular in cross section, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have such a rectangular shape in cross section to the end of the liner section in order to enhance the stability for the end portion while it is placed to the flat surface of the ground.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed November 19, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With respect to the argument that Koch's water distribution system being mounted above ground and adjustable in height and Suezo'640's liner system being installed in

Application/Control Number: 10/731,315

Art Unit: 3673

an existing ditch below ground so these references are not properly combinable, it is more limited than the claim scope and both Suezo's liner and Koch's flume are equivalent in function while these devices are transporting water therein and further, Suezo's liner has a connector flange being capable of receiving the Koch's anchor rod for adjusting the height according to the installation site where the end unit of the liner being placed on the slope area and Koch's anchoring rod also provides the anchor/spike portion for fixing the device into the ground as well as the adjustable height portion.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claim 6 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

7. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 3673

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jong-Suk (James) Lee whose telephone number is (703) 308-6777. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 am to 3:00 pm, Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather C. Shackelford, can be reached on (703) 308-2978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

J. Lee /jjl February 4, 2005

> Jong-Suk (James) Lee Primary Examiner Art Unit 3673